DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 469 CE 055 997

AUTHOR Pomerance, Anita
TITLE A Collaborative Adult Literacy Training Workshop for Tutors and Students: The Student-Tutor Orientation.
INSTITUTION Center for Literacy, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Div. of Adult Basic and Literacy Education Programs.
PUB DATE Jun 90
NOTE 29p.; Project Number 98-0028.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Language Experience Approach; *Literacy Education; *Orientation; Reading Comprehension; *Reading Instruction; Reading Programs; Teaching Methods; *Tutoring; Tutors; *Volunteer Training; Whole Language Approach; Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS 353 Project

ABSTRACT

A pilot tutor training project, the Student-Tutor Orientation (STO), was designed to meet the need for making whole-language concepts of reading and writing instruction accessible to tutors as well as students through hands-on experience and for establishing a collaborative tutoring relationship in which students share in decision making. Together, tutors and students at a literacy program in a large Northeastern city learned the new concepts and strategies such as the language experience method. Use of materials relating to student goals and interests was emphasized, with instruction on how to make difficult but interesting texts accessible through such strategies as student listening and duet reading. Writing was stressed from the beginning, using invented spelling if necessary. After a year's use, in which 11 STOs were given and 97 tutor-student pairs trained, the approach seems to be superior to the agency's former training methods in several respects. Retention of tutors after training and hours of service surpassed those of a comparable series of the Center for Literacy's training a year ago. Tutors expressed increased confidence, and tutors and students reported more goal-related materials used and more writing done. Staff members requested STOs for their areas, stating that they felt the STOs produced better tutoring. Students were enthusiastic about their progress and their gains in self-esteem. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED324469

A Collaborative Adult Literacy Training Workshop for Tutors and Students: The Student-Tutor Orientation

Anita Pomerance, Tutor Training Coordinator
The Center for Literacy

June, 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christopher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE 055 777

A Collaborative Adult Literacy Training Workshop for Tutors and Students: The Student-Tutor Orientation

Anita Pomerance, Tutor Training Coordinator
The Center for Literacy

Fiscal Year 1989-90

The Center for Literacy
3723 Chestnut St.
Philadelphia, PA 19104

(215) 382-3700

Federal Funds: $18,129.28

SEA Project Number: 98-0028

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in part by the Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education or the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and no official endorsement by these agencies should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....3

Introduction.....4

The Problem.....7

Goals and Objectives.....9

Procedures Employed.....10

Objectives Met.....15

Objective Not Met.....15

Evaluation Techniques.....16

Results of the Evaluation.....17

Distribution of the Findings.....24

Conclusions and Recommendations.....24

Bibliography.....27

ABSTRACT

This innovative tutor training project, termed the Student-Tutor Orientation (STO), was designed to meet the need for making whole-language concepts of reading and writing instruction accessible to tutors as well as to students through hands-on experience, and for establishing a collaborative tutoring relationship in which students share in decision-making. Together, tutors and students learned the new concepts and strategies such as the language experience method. Use of materials relating to student goals and interests was emphasized, with instruction on how to make difficult but interesting texts accessible through strategies including student listening and duet reading. Writing was stressed from the beginning, using invented spelling if necessary.

The STO seems to be superior to the agency's former training in several respects. Retention of tutors after training and hours of service surpassed those of a comparable series of The Center for Literacy's trainings a year ago. Tutors expressed increased confidence, and tutors and students reported more goal-related materials used and more writing done. Staff members requested STO's for their areas, stating that they felt the STO's produced better tutoring. Students were enthusiastic about their progress and their gains in self-esteem.

Introduction

This project piloted an innovative tutor training intended to enhance the quality of one-to-one adult literacy instruction by volunteers. In the training, termed the Student-Tutor Orientation (STO), tutors and students were trained together, after an initial session for tutors only dealing with adult learners and reading and writing processes. The training was for ten hours, spread over four sessions. The purpose of the training was to model holistic approaches to reading and writing instruction, with primary emphasis on comprehension, rather than subskills approaches emphasizing phonics or sight words. The objectives of the project were to pilot the innovative training by recruiting and training 60 tutors and 60 students in six ten-hour, four-session trainings over two three-month periods, with each period followed by evaluation and redesign.

The project grew out of concerns expressed by staff who managed volunteers and supported by subsequent research. Staff members reported that many tutors were not using the whole-language approaches advocated in the required tutor training, but tended to depend on traditional subskills approaches of teaching isolated words and letters. They also stated that frequently tutors and students appeared not to develop the collaborative relationship considered appropriate for adult learners, but maintained a relationship in which the tutor remained in charge. These concerns were supported by systematic research within the

agency consisting of close analysis of five tutor-student pairs, analysis of reports by 128 tutors at 25 meetings, and telephone interviews with 47 tutors.

Staff members came to the conclusion that presenting desired innovative instructional approaches through lectures, role-play simulation and discussion was inadequate for motivating change in tutors. The approaches tutors used were probably based on their own remembered school experiences. Their reluctance to try the unfamilar approaches presented in the training could stem from inexperience, insecurity and forgetting. Staff members felt that prospective tutors would accept new teaching approaches more readily if given the opportunity to try them out with their students immediately. An added benefit of including students in the training would be that they, too, would understand the concepts underlying recommended strategies. The result was the Student-Tutor Orientation. Our increased awareness of the role of students as training participants led us to change the project title to give equal emphasis to students and tutors.

The project activities took place within twelve months, beginning with planning the schedule and recruitment of tutors and students in July. After a pilot Student-Tutor Orientation in August with tutors and students already in the program, 11 Orientations were given between September 1, 1989 and June 30, 1990.

Two staff members conducted the trainings, Anita Pomerance, Tutor Training Coordinator, and Martha Merson, Coordinator of the Center City area of Philadelphia. Both these staff members had previously participated (with two others) in developing the STO. Two staff members, Marcine Pickron-Davis and Yvette Walls, provided feedback after participating in the in-house August pilot. Coordinators for the five areas in which STO's occurred recruited and screened students and tutors and attended all or part of the training. They were: Lawrence Brady, Clare Ignatowski, Linda Jilk, Tessa Lamont, Laura Mercer, Kathleen Murphy and Camille Realo. Kathy Tarley also interviewed prospective students and tutors.

The agency in which the STO was piloted is located in a large Northeastern city. It was established in 1968, and currently serves over 1900 students a year, approximately half in classes, and half through one-to-one tutoring. It is funded primarily through government grants, foundations and corporate giving.

This report should be found useful by the administrators of any program using volunteer tutors to provide adult literacy services. It is being submitted to:

Dr. John Christopher
Division of Adult Basic and Literacy Education Programs
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Education
333 Market St.
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

Permanent copies of the report will be filed for the next five years at:

AdvancE
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Education
333 Market St.
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

The Problem

Although all tutors at The Center for Literacy (CFL) were required to attend a nine-hour training before beginning to work with a student, staff who worked directly with tutors observed that many of the strategies recommended in the training were not being used, and concluded that the central concepts of the tutor training were often either not grasped, forgotten, or not used through insecurity. Many tutors were not applying the idea of reading as primarily the making of meaning presented in the training and supported by research (Rumelhart, 1976; Harste & Burke, 1978; Smith, 1985). They tended to depend on phonics-oriented workbooks and word lists, and seemed to see reading as primarily a process of decoding and recognizing words. The subskills approach to reading preferred by many tutors creates a false picture of what reading is; it is incompatible with current concepts of reading as making meaning. Having learners focus first on letters rather than meaning distracts them from the essence of reading. Focusing primarily on phonics instruction is inappropriate for adult learners for three reasons. First, it stresses rote memorization, which is difficult for many adults,

second, it fails to use adults' rich store of life experience (Cross, 1981) and finally, it postpones meaningful reading, disregarding adult learners' orientation to immediate practical use (Knowles, 1979). Another problem in tutoring was that tutors adopted the traditional role of teacher in charge of instruction rather than work with their adult student in the collaborative "adult to adult" role advocated in the training and supported by adult learning theory (Freire, 1970; Knowles, 1979; Brookfield, 1985).

Research within the agency supported the staff members' reports. A series of telephone interviews with 45 tutors revealed a very traditional view of reading instruction. Many used phonics-oriented workbooks. They reported that they had tried whole-language approaches such as the language experience approach but their student hadn't been "ready" for it. An in-depth study of five student-tutor pairs revealed instructional activities and tutor assertions which implied a linear view of the reading process as beginning with sounding out letters and recognizing words. Although the tutors used a variety of materials, their chief focus was on word-level accuracy. The majority of their time was devoted to monitoring oral reading, with frequent correction and word-level instruction. Little time was devoted to discussion of the meaning of the text, or to writing. The emphasis on recitation and evaluation necessarily placed the tutor in a leadership position. Observation of a larger group, 125 tutors at 28 tutor

meetings, revealed a similar pattern for the majority. The training, it appeared, was not making it easy for the majority of new tutors to use the recommended approaches.

A smaller number of tutors, however, used the whole-language approaches recommended in the training and described their efforts to establish a relationship of equality with their students. The work of these tutors suggested that the view of adult literacy instruction presented in the training was within the capacity of volunteer tutors. It appeared that a modification in training procedures was needed to make the views presented accessible to a larger proportion of the tutors.

Goals and Objectives

To meet these needs, it was decided to pilot and revise, as needed, a newly designed training workshop, the Student-Tutor Orientation (STO), in which tutors and students are trained together in effective strategies for learning reading and writing through explanation, modeling and hands-on experience. The objective was to give six ten-hour, four-session workshops, in which a total of 60 tutors and 60 students would be trained.

This training would convey to tutors the concept of reading as making meaning and the idea that learning to read is best accomplished through wide reading in materials of interest to the reader. Tutors would become aware of strategies to make difficult but interesting materials accessible to learners, and would learn strategies for

integrating instruction on isolated words with reading meaningful texts, including when to allocate time for such instruction and how to relate it back to the text (Lytle & Botel, 1988). As with all learning, strategies based on a meaning-making view of reading are learned and remembered best if they are presented, demonstrated and used immediately. Writing is also learned best when strategies presented are followed by guided experience in producing relevant texts. Tutors and students would gain a new concept of tutoring modeled more on such learning situations as driving a car or learning procedures at a new job. Rather than thinking of tutoring as remedial and school-like, they would come to see it as cooperative learning between peers.

Procedures Employed

Eleven Student Tutor Orientations were presented over five areas of the city during the year. The purpose of this orientation is to teach concepts of adult learning and of reading and writing as meaning-making processes through presentations immediately followed by hands-on experience. Rather than tutors role playing new strategies with other tutors, tutors and students use them together. After experiencing the strategies, they process them through group discussion.

The first session of the STO is for tutors only, after which the tutors are matched with a student and the two come together, approximately two weeks later, to STO sessions two

and three, which are usually spaced two days apart. The student-tutor pairs meet twice a week for about a month, and then come together to the final STO session.

The first session of the STO is intended to give prospective tutors insight into the situation of adult literacy learners, the reading process, how to work on writing, and measuring progress through portfolios of student work and learning logs written after each session. Demographic descriptions of the CFL student population and transcripts of student interviews are used to convey the idea that low-literate adults are a varied group, capable in many ways, whose difficulties with reading and writing are often caused by societal factors beyond their control. Tutors are also alerted to the reality that since tutoring may turn out to be short term, it should be oriented to learner independence and immediate practical application.

The concept of reading as a meaning-making transaction between the reader and the text is communicated through examining the tutors' strategies for dealing with unintelligible signs (written in the Cyrillic alphabet) and ambiguous paragraphs. They learn the role of the reader's expectations and prior knowledge, and the importance, for comprehending texts, of discusssion before, during and after reading. The technique of initiating, sharing and responding to sustained writing is learned through hands-on practice, as tutors and trainers write together, followed by trainers modeling and discussing positive, specific

responses which respect learners' ownership of their texts. Tutors are introduced to the concept of keeping a portfolio, collecting student work to measure progress. They also learn about writing a brief learning log with the student at the end of each session, recording work done and success achieved, so as to note progress and plan for future lessons.

In sessions two and three, students and tutors read, write and discuss together, thereby gaining an understanding of learning as collaboration. At session two, they share their own experiences as adult learners, and reflect on the fact that adult learning is generally participatory and collaborative, with a supportive helper providing demonstration and opportunity for practice and feedback. The point is made that literacy tutoring should resemble other adult learning experiences, such as learning to drive, more than the teacher-controlled relationships of school.

Next, the adult learners brainstorm what they would like to read about, and three categories of reading material are discussed: material related to student goals, student-written material, and texts written for adult learners. The language experience approach for generating student-written material is explained, and participants produce a text to be read later in the session. The learners also select a text for this purpose from those reviewed by the trainer. Using a poem in an anthology with an evocative title, participants

experience discussion before and after reading and the value of listening as another reads.

The participants next learn the advantages and techniques of four different ways of reading: 1) listening (to the tutor or a tape), 2) silent reading, 3) reading together (echo or duet reading), 4) oral reading. Tutors are urged to save word-level instruction for the end of the reading session, rather than interrupt the flow of thought. The techniques for reading are tried out by the participants in a 20-minute practice session followed by a discussion of what was easy or hard, and why. The session closes with descriptions of measuring progress with portfolios and the collaborative writing of a learning log.

The next session begins with a brainstorm about writing topics, followed by instructions for overcoming spelling barriers (invent a spelling, use the initial letter only, leave a blank, ask someone). Then all participants, including trainers, engage in ten minutes of sustained free writing. Pairs share their writing if they wish, and all participants are then invited to share with the group. Respectful and specific feedback is modeled by the trainer as in the first session. The importance of writing in this way at every session is emphasized.

A discussion of tutors' and students' strategies for dealing with unknown words introduces the presentation on integrating word-level instruction with the reading of meaningful texts. After explanation of how to generate a

list of words during reading for future study, strategies are presented for using the context (a cloze exercise of the group learning log), learning sight words (flash cards) and sound-spelling patterns (generating lists of rhyming, similarly spelled words). These strategies are used by the pairs in a twenty-minute session, followed by discussion of satisfactions and concerns.

The pairs then write together a specific plan for working on a short-term goal and write a learning log of what was accomplished and enjoyed in this session. The group shares reflections on the STO. The tutors and students will now meet together as pairs for approximately four weeks.

At the final session, a month later, tutors and students meet in separate groups to describe their sessions, with attention to impressions of progress, degree of collaborativeness and work related to students' real-life goals. Because tutors have shown a tendency to postpone writing, particular attention is paid to whether writing is being done. Solutions to concerns or problems are explored. The groups then unite and share the results of their discussion. Participants next learn about opportunities for tutors and students within CFL, including using the computer centers, tutor inservice meetings, student meetings, opportunities to help with public relations, Bible study groups and writing groups. The session closes with an evaluation of the training.

Objectives Met

The objective of conducting six Student-Tutor Orientations to serve a total of 60 tutors and 60 students was surpassed. Eleven trainings were given, with 97 tutors and 97 students completing the training. Originally, two areas were selected for the workshops, but since coordinators who observed the trainings requested them for their areas, STO's were given in all five areas of the city in which trainings normally were given. The whole-language approaches to reading and writing instruction and the collaborative student-tutor relationship were modeled and practiced as planned.

Objective Not Met

The objective of having an average of 10 tutors and 10 students at a training was not met for the first six workshops, in which 53 attended and 47 completed. However, an average of 10 attending trainings and 9 completing was achieved over the 11 workshops in which a total of 112 attended and 97 completed. Furthermore, it was found that retention was higher in trainings of fewer than 10. Of the 5 trainings with under 10 participants, 92% completed, while of the 6 with 10 or over, 84% completed. The table below shows the total numbers in each size of training.

Size of Group	Attended	Completed	Retention
10 and over	75	63	84%
under 10	37	34	92%

Evaluation Techniques

The success of the training was evaluated in several ways. First, quantitative evaluation based on attendance statistics compared the Student-Tutor Orientations with equivalent regular CFL trainings given a year ago. Trainings a year ago were selected which matched as closely as possible the STO workshops in area of the city, time of year, and size of group. The workshops were compared in regard to:

1. Tutor retention from beginning to end of training
2. Tutors trained compared to tutors matched
3. Months of tutoring within a given period
4. Hours of tutoring per month of tutoring

For the comparisons, the first 8 STO workshops were selected for comparison with 8 comparable workshops because they met the goal of 60 tutors and 60 students trained. These figures revealed the effectiveness of the training in retention of tutors and in hours of service.

Second, the workshops were evaluated qualitatively through:

1. Written student and tutor evaluations of the STO
2. Assessment interviews with students after the STO
3. Interviews with tutors about the STO and their subsequent tutoring
4. Tutors' written reports of their own tutoring after the STO
5. Staff observations about the STO, including the quality of tutoring between STO pairs, compared to others
6. Student comments about their own learning during and after the STO

This data revealed the impact of the training in promoting effective adult literacy instruction.

Results of the Evaluation

Quantitative: Retention and Hours of Service

STO trainings surpassed regular trainings in retaining tutors during training, with 87% compared to 81% in the regular trainings, as follows:

Training	Attended	Completed	Per Cent
STO	79 *	69	87%
Regular	126	102	81%

* While 97 tutors attended training, the first 79 to attend are evaluated here.

They surpassed regular trainings strikingly in matching trained tutors, with 94% matched compared to 61% in regular trainings, as follows:

Training	Completed	Matched	Per Cent
STO	69	65	94%
Regular	102	62	61%

The high percentage of matches for the STO is explained by the fact that all tutors were supposed to be matched during the training. Tutors were interviewed and screened before training. The 6% who were not matched consist of those whose student did not come to the training and who shortly thereafter decided not to tutor, or in one case, a tutor who was judged unsuitable. The higher proportion of unmatched tutors in the regular training consist of a combination of

occasional visitors such as new staff members, unsuitable tutors and people who changed their minds about tutoring during the waiting period between the end of the training and the appointment to meet a student.

In the first months after the training, STO tutors were active for a greater number of months (77% of the months observed) compared to tutors from the regular trainings (71% of the months observed). The period of time compared ranged from 8 months to 2 months, depending on how close to the time of writing this report the particular STO training took place. During these months, STO tutor-student pairs also averaged a greater number of hours per month, 8.5 compared to 6.4, as follows:

Training	% Months Active	Average Monthly Hours
STO	77%	8.5
Regular	71%	6.4

These figures reveal that the STO workshops produced a greater return in service provided to clients for number of tutors recruited and hours of training provided, with less attrition between initial attendance at a training and actual tutoring. A greater percentage of tutors became active after training, and they gave more hours of tutoring per month.

Qualitative: Reports from Students, Tutors and Staff

Written questionnaire responses from tutors and students after the STO were studied. Students and tutors were interviewed and the results compared with interviews of

students and tutors who had experienced the regular training. Comments from staff and tutors' evaluations of their experience in a final report for a college class were also informative. Comments during discussion among tutors in the training and, most strikingly, students after a few weeks of tutoring gave further testimony to the training's success.

Interviews with 8 students who participated in the STO and 8 who took the regular training were compared. The control group was chosen by random selection from all areas of the city. For both groups, one of the chief purposes of the interview was to document the students' experiences in the program, especially the changes they noted in their own performance. The interviews were studied for the following: sense of progress, student-tutor relations, decision-making, use of real-world materials and goal-related reading and writing.

Students who attended the STO were more likely to talk positively about their progress. Students from the control group more often expressed discouragement because they had anticipated more progress than they felt they had made. The responses to the questions about tutor-student relationships were scattered. Students from the control group were more likely to say they were involved in the decison-making, but no one in either group said anything negative about the tutor.

The greatest difference between the groups was their account of use of materials and goal-related instruction. Almost every student in the STO group described doing goal-related reading and writing and using real-world materials. Only a minority of the students in the control group reported such activities.

The STO was very successful in achieving its goal of enhancing students' understanding of the nature of reading and writing, as well as encouraging them to take an active role in providing feedback. STO students were more articulate than the control group in explaining what kind of reading and writing were done in and out of sessions. Some STO students made suggestions for improving instruction, including a student who complained that his tutor was not using a wide enough range of activities, including writing. None in the control group made suggestions or complaints. In addition, students who went through the STO focused first on the content and meaning of reading and writing, rather than expressing the skill-based view of literacy revealed by the members of the control group.

Interviews with 10 tutors who had experienced the STO were compared with interviews with 40 tutors who went to a regular training. The control group was selected at random from those who had tutored at least two months.

The most striking difference between tutoring activities was that the majority of STO tutors reported working on writing, whereas few in the control group

reported doing so. A larger proportion of the STO tutors also reported using goal-related, real-life materials, in contrast to the control group who predominantly spoke of using phonics-oriented workbooks.

Tutors who had experienced the STO reported feeling greater confidence, after the training, about their ability to tutor. They commented that tutoring no longer seemed "mysterious," and that they felt "comfortable" and free to be "flexible" and "creative." None reported feeling nervous after the training; the only reservation expressed was by one tutor who would have liked more "specifics" about instruction. In contrast, 50% of the tutors interviewed who took the regular training recalled feeling apprehensive after the training about being able to tutor.

Evaluations of the training, written by students and tutors at the last session, were 86% positive. Tutors and students valued the hands-on practice in reading writing, the different suggestions on how to read, and hearing about what other people did. They spoke of the value of getting to know their students or tutors and of learning with others. They said that they learned better because their student was also learning, and they found the group to be a learning resource. Tutors also stated that the format of the workshop helped break down belittling myths and stereotypes about adult literacy learners.

Reports written by tutors in college revealed that important concepts introduced in the STO were assimilated.

Many tutors spoke of their relationship as a partnership with their literacy students. They described providing a "no-pressure environment," and believed that their "student-centered" approach was more effective than traditional authoritarian relationships, as the adult learners learn "exactly what they want." They knew how to measure progress by observing changes in their students' willingness to read print such as signs or the newspaper and by comparing samples of earlier and later student writing.

Staff members demonstrated their acceptance of the STO by requesting it for trainings in their areas. These requests motivated the planners of the STO to expand the areas of the city in which STO trainings were given from two to five. The following unsolicited communications from two different coordinators are representative of staff response:

> I just wanted to share with you the results of the last STO. It's really remarkable! I've gotten the best and most positive feedback from both tutors and students... The students are doing so much writing and really enjoying the process. It's incredible. It seems that the training really had an impact as far as encouraging students to write. Also, the pairs are meeting very rgularly and doing a lot of creative things. I just wanted to share my happiness with you, and commend you on the STO development/training. It works!

> STO is a vast improvement in terms of:
> * putting student and tutor on a more equal footing
> * informing students of techniques for learning
> * allowing tutors to learn techniques in a hands-on way
> * eliminating anxiety over who my student will be
> * eliminating the "us-them" mindset that is the root of many misconceptions among both tutors and students.

Others reported that they felt the topics flowed naturally from one another, and that seeing a roomful of tutors and students learning together was deeply satisfying.

Students discussing their learning experiences after the STO made extremely enthusiastic comments. Some expressed the following sentiments after the first month of tutoring:

> It helps you feel good. I feel so good inside. I'm kind of shy, but I feel so good I want to tell everybody about it.
>
> I learned more in the last few weeks than I learned in all my life. I'm determined now. I've been out of school for 47 years, and I learned more now.

They assessed their own progress by describing how the instruction after the STO had affected their daily lives:

> I buy the Daily News every day and read a part of it. I never used to try.
>
> I'm doing better with applications now, and with my reading, there's a better flow.
>
> I know I'm going to learn. I can spell something and not be ashamed. The other day my boss asked me to read a letter. I asked for a couple of minutes, then I read it.
>
> I work as a security guard, 6 PM to 6 AM., and I read on the job, now. I read a whole book the other night, only missed two words, the second book in my life.

During the training, students said that they felt encouraged by learning they were not alone in having reading difficulties. One said, "I learned not to be ashamed."

Distribution of the Findings

The findings, as described in this report, are available to adult literacy providers state-wide. The report is on file with The Center for Literacy, Tutors of Literacy in the Commonwealth, the Pennsylvania Department of Education's AdvancE, and the ERIC Index. The project director or other participating Center for Literacy staff members are available to present results of the project at the Pennsylvania Adult and Continuing Education conference in Hershey, Pennsylvania and other national adult education conferences.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The pilot of the Student-Tutor Orientation demonstrated that it is a highly effective way to teach principles of adult literacy learning to both tutors and students. The hands-on approach helped tutors and students understand the importance of engaging in a variety of ways of reading, and of doing ample reading and writing, together and independently. The collaborative format modeled a relationship of partners which was maintained in the sessions after the training. Statistics on retention during and immediately after training and on amount of service provided revealed higher rates for the STO tutors than for a control group, especially for the percentage of tutors trained to tutors matched.

Training students and tutors together, using hands-on practice after methods and materials have been presented, is recommended for all tutor training. However, some alterations of procedures may be necessary. One source of stress for coordinators was the shortness of the time available for matching tutors and students. Two weeks to ten days were available between the first session (for tutors only) and the second (with tutors and students together). While this interval was judged to be effective for retention of students and tutors, scheduling and conducting the three-person meetings involved in matching pairs within that time often proved difficult. Therefore, in a few large trainings of twelve or fifteen pairs, students were asked at their initial interview to appear for introduction to their tutor at the second STO session. Such a procedure might prove effective in motivating student attendance, as students might come more readily if they felt it was the only way to be assured of receiving a tutor. On the other hand, some students might be less likely to come to a training if the prospective tutor were still a stranger. In any case, matching at the training saves time for the coordinator.

Introducing a new training approach that requires change in staff routines is best done gradually, with opportunity for staff to observe, participate and offer feedback. Detailed explanation of the rationale for the innovation should be available to all staff involved, not

only out of respect for their viewpoints, but to enable them to recruit tutors and students. An initial training using experienced students, tutors and staff is recommended. Subsequent trainings then should be attended by staff members who work with tutors so they can experience them personally.

While attendance by both tutor and student of every pair is the ideal, it is possible for tutors to attend the training without their student, joining either a pair or another tutor for hands-on experience. Students also may attend without their own tutor, working with another pair or a tutor.

When the difficulties caused by time pressures and absenteeism are resolved, our experience has shown that training students and tutors together enhances literacy instruction. It promotes the approaches to adult literacy instruction supported by current research in the fields of literacy instruction and adult learning, and it appears to improve the amount of service delivery per tutor trained. The enthusiasm of staff, tutors, and most important, students, demonstrates that structuring the initial orientation to include students is worth doing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brookfield, S. (1985). A critical definition of adult education. Adult Education Quarterly, 36 (1), 44-49.

Cross, K. (1981). Adults as learners. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Seabury.

Harste, J., and Burke, C. (1978). Toward a psycholinguistic model of reading comprehension. Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning, 54 (3), 9-34.

Knowles, M. (1978). The adult learner: A neglected species. Houston, TX: Gulf.

Lytle, S. and Botel, M. (1988). PCRP II: Reading, writing and talking across the curriculum. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Rumelhart, D. (1976). Toward an interactive model of reading, CHIP Report #56. San Diego, CA: University of California, Center for Human Information Processing.

Smith, F. (1985). Reading without nonsense, 2nd edition. New York: Teachers College Press.